record prosperity. Simple justice as well as our economic self-interest requires dedicated action to minimize the dislocations and costs that come with progress—to create new employment opportunities and to help displaced workers find and adjust to new jobs promptly.

We know that if management and labor, regions and communities, schools and governments can foresee the extent and nature of impending changes, they can often take effective steps to protect workers through retraining and relocation, reliance on attrition to make necessary reductions, and other measures; to revamp the local industrial base in light of new possibilities opened by new technology; and to develop new skills, new programs, new institutions to take advantage of new economic opportunities.

You have asked the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy to explore what is being done and what can be done by management and labor to meet displacement and adjustment problems which automation and technology raise for workers, unions, and employers.

Beyond this, however, I believe it necessary for the Nation to undertake a more far-reaching, comprehensive, and dispassionate effort than heretofore to identify and assess the directions in which automation and other continuing technological advances are thrusting forward; the range of steps we can embark on to reap technology's full potential for the good of all our people while preventing and easing adverse effects on individual workers and communities.

To this end, I submit to you this draft providing for Congress to establish a National Commission on Automation and Technological Progress to gage our technological course and recommend how to gain its maximum benefit with minimum adverse impact.

Respectfully yours,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Michigan on the introduction of the bill, for I think it deals with probably the major domestic economic issue which confronts the country. As he knows, for a long time I have advocated the appointed of a presidential National Council of Automation. I proposed it in formal form last year at one time, when President Kennedy adopted the proposal, and included in it a recommendation which he made in connection with the then railroad crisis which plagued us. Subsequently, he made very clear that he was in favor of the appointment of such a Commission, with legislative support. I am delighted that President Johnson has followed in support of the same program, and I congratulate him on the announcement—as I said this morning in the Education Subcommittee—of the appointment of such a Commission.

I consider it an honor to join as one of the cosponsors of the bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan.

ADDITIONAL REGULATORY AUTHORITY OVER COMMUNICATIONS COMMON CARRIERS BY THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over communications common carriers.

This proposed legislation has been requested by the Federal Communications Commission. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission and accompanying statement explaining the purposes of the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2624) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission certain additional regulatory authority over communications common carriers, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1964.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress a proposal to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission certain additional regulatory authority over communications common carriers by adding a new section 223.

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Yours sincerely,

E. WILLIAM HENRY, *Chairman.*

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TITLE II OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, AS AMENDED, TO GIVE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION REGULATORY AUTHORITY OVER THE INTERCHANGE OF COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES BETWEEN COMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS

This proposal would give the Commission statutory authority over the charges and other terms and conditions in arrangements between communications common carriers for the interchange of their communications facilities or in arrangements between communications carriers regarding the furnishing of facilities or services by one communications carrier to another.

In order to implement this authority so that the public convenience and necessity will be fully protected the proposal would also empower the Commission, upon petition and after a full opportunity for hearing, to order one common carrier to provide interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio to one or more other carriers if the Commission finds that the service sought will serve the public convenience and necessity.

Since, under the Communications Act, the provision of facilities by one common carrier to another common carrier is not regarded as a common carrier undertaking, the Commission has no regulatory authority over the charges and other terms and conditions in arrangements between such carriers for the interchange of their communications facilities or in arrangements regarding the furnishing of facilities or services by one communications common carrier to another. This statutory hiatus makes it possible for one carrier to discriminate in its charges for the rental and use of its facilities by other common carriers with a resultant detrimental effect on both services and charges to the public. The Commission, therefore, believes that it needs the requested additional authority to fully protect the public convenience and necessity in this area.

By way of example, it is possible under the present law for one carrier to refuse to lease facilities to another at charges, and under terms and conditions, as favorable as it leases its same facilities to the public. It is also possible for a carrier to lease facilities to one carrier at charges, or under terms and conditions, more favorable to such carrier than to another carrier. Thus the leasing carrier's service to the public is limited and its charges to the public are also affected without either the leasing carrier or the public having an effective forum to consider their interests.

It is to be noted that this provision would parallel section 401 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 741) which provides that the furnishing of satellite terminal station facilities by one communication carrier to another is deemed to be a common carrier activity fully subject to the Communications Act. In explaining why such provision was added to that act, the report of the Senate Committee on Commerce stated:

"The reason for this amendment is because the provision of facilities by one common carrier to another common carrier has not been regarded as a common carrier undertaking." (S. Rept. No. 1584, 87th Cong., 2d sess.)

Somewhat similar authority is given Civil Aeronautics Board by the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (cf. section 412, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, 49 U.S.C. 1382).[1]

To insure that this new authority would fully protect the public interest the Commis-

[1] That section provides:

"(a) Every air carrier shall file with the Board a true copy, or, if oral, a true and complete memorandum, of every contract or agreement (whether enforceable by provisions for liquidated damages, penalties, bonds, or otherwise) affecting air transportation and in force on the effective date of this section or hereafter entered into, or any modification or cancellation thereof, between such air carrier and any other air carrier, foreign air carrier, or other carrier for pooling or apportioning earnings, losses, traffic, service, or equipment, or relating to the establishment of transportation rates, fares, charges, or classifications, or for preserving and improving safety, economy, and efficiency of operation, or for controlling, regulating, preventing, or otherwise eliminating destructive, oppressive, or wasteful competition, or for regulating stops, schedules, and character of service, or for other cooperative working arrangements.

"(b) The Board shall by order disapprove any such contract or agreement, whether or not previously approved by it, that it finds to be adverse to the public interest, or in violation of this chapter, and shall by order approve any such contract or agreement, or any modification or cancellation thereof, that it does not find to be adverse to the public interest, or in violation of this chapter; except that the Board may not approve any contract or agreement between an air carrier not directly engaged in the operation of aircraft in air transportation and a common carrier subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, governing the compensation to be received by such common carrier for transportation services performed by it."

sion also believes that it should be able under appropriate circumstances to order one carrier to provide service to another. Otherwise, even if the Commission were able to regulate the charges and terms and conditions applicable to the interchange of facilities among carriers, it would still be powerless to require carriers in the first instance to furnish facilities or services to another carrier or to require a carrier to continue to furnish facilities to another carrier although it may be in the public interest to do so. Absence of such authority might result in costly duplication of facilities by two common carriers, with a resultant adverse effect on the public. Under the new regulatory authority which the Commission is requesting it could, upon receipt of a petition and after a full opportunity for hearing, order one of the carriers to lease its facilities to the other if the public convenience and necessity would be served thereby.

Thus, the Commission believes that in order more effectively to carry out its statutory duties in the public interest this additional regulatory authority is needed to remedy those situations where, because of a statutory gap, it is powerless to assure that the public is provided with the most economical and efficient communication service.

Adopted May 8, 1963.

CLAIMS OF AMERICAN NATIONALS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am today introducing proposed legislation that is the first constructive and affirmative step taken on behalf of U.S. citizens who, as residents of Cuba prior to Castro, were the victims of the Communist evil that he brought to that country.

But it is equally a measure for the general public good since it brings our bookkeeping up to date by providing for immediate adjudication of U.S. losses in Cuba and, most important, it seeks to make available the talents of hundreds of Latin-experienced American businessmen to the Alliance for Progress.

The bill calls for the adjudication of all claims at this time, for loans to claimants holding adjudicated claims and for the creation of a fund that will utilize blocked Cuban assets in the United States. These are highly worthwhile goals.

The adjudication of the losses of our own citizens in Cuba is long overdue and as time passes, it will become more and more difficult for these individuals to find the necessary documents and witnesses to substantiate their cases. By putting off this matter, we are simply adding to the confusion of some future date—for all of these matters will have to be resolved sooner or later.

Nor is it any answer to state that we should wait until records are available from Cuba. This presumes that despite the passage of 5 years of Communist tyranny in Cuba, its individual and corporate records will remain available for processing at some indefinite date in the future. Quite to the contrary, when we bargain with the government that succeeds in ousting Castro, we should have in our possession at that time an as accurate as possible statement of U.S. losses in Cuba.

But in these 5 long years, we have done nothing to prepare that statement, which leaves us in a position where we are forced to rely on rough estimates and unsupported guesses.

The first sections of this bill provide for the presentation of all claims within 6 months of passage of the act and for the adjudication of all claims through the regular channels of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

The measure also proposes that blocked Cuban assets in the United States—a figure estimated to reach nearly $200 million—be turned over to the proper U.S. Government official and, after 5 percent has been allotted to the United States for expenses, that these funds be made available to the claimants who hold adjudicated claims.

I am especially interested in that part of the bill which is aimed at stimulating the use of the now dormant talents of hundreds of U.S. businessmen who lost out to communism in Cuba. The beneficiaries of this measure are Americans who, through their investments in Cuba, have contributed to the economic development of the hemisphere and who, through no fault of their own, have, in many instances, lost their entire savings and means of livelihood.

The section of this legislation which permits claimants to secure loans up to 80 percent of their adjudicated claims for the purpose of reinvesting in Alliance for Progress programs will encourage these people to make use of their past experience and talents and at the same time promote private investment in Latin America—so necessary if the Alliance is to be a success.

I believe that this bill constitutes a constructive answer to this growing problem. It would permit experienced bilingual Americans to become a strategic part of our oversea economy.

This is the way a democracy should act. This is the way that the United States can demonstrate to other countries that it can use with imagination the talents of those of its citizens who, though once caught in the crosscurrents of communism, are nevertheless willing to once again export democracy throughout Latin America.

It is also important to point out that this piece of legislation is aimed at helping the small investor in Cuba. Large corporations and businesses have already written off most of their losses but up until now there has been no recourse provided to compensate the individual.

I might also mention that since its establishment in 1949, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has adjudicated millions of dollars in losses suffered by Americans in Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary. It appears to me only fair and equitable that similar legislation be enacted to include the adjudication of claims against the present Government of Cuba.

In conclusion, I am convinced that this bill will help our position in the hemisphere and that it is a fresh and positive answer to the evil of communism in Cuba. I have been extremely pleased by the great interest generated by this proposal and urge that it receive favorable action by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2625) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of American nationals against the Government of Cuba; to provide for payment of such claims; and to provide that the uncompensated portion of approved claims may be the collateral for certain loans made to claimants by the Secretary of State, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, Senate bill 2590, to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation, and for other purposes, was introduced on March 3, 1964, at the request of the Department of the Navy, and was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Since this bill amends title 37, United States Code, which relates to pay and allowances of military personnel and dependents, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of S. 2590 and that it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREE IMPORTATION OF WILD ANIMALS AND WILD BIRDS—AMENDMENT TO RESTRICT IMPORTS OF BEEF, VEAL, MUTTON, AND LAMB

AMENDMENT NO. 467

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk until 5 p.m. this evening, so that the names of cosponsors may be added.

The proposal is identical to the text contained in the bill I introduced last Friday, S. 2612, on behalf of myself and a number of other Senators, which provided for mandatory quotas on imports of fresh, chilled, and frozen beef, veal, mutton, and lamb at the level of 1960 imports. It is my intention to propose this amendment and testify in its behalf at the hearing to be held by the Senate Finance Committee beginning tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment (No. 467) was referred to the Committee on Finance as follows: